

1

## 2

3

4

5

6

7

$$\begin{pmatrix} ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{pmatrix}$$

9

15

18

25

1 On January 31, 2001, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination. Appellant's  
2 exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

3  
4 Appellant works in the Facilities Management and Building Maintenance Department at CWU.  
5 Appellant and Respondent agree that the September 1995 PD accurately describes Appellant's  
6 position. The PD describes Appellant's duties as 60 percent carpentry work, including remodeling,  
7 construction, maintenance and finish work; 15 percent installing flooring and fencing; 10 percent  
8 concrete and masonry work; and 10 percent roofing.

9  
10 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argues that the Board should consider the volume  
11 of work he performs rather than the percentages of work described in his PD. Appellant contends  
12 that if he had known that volume of work was not used as the basis for an allocation, he would have  
13 provided different information showing the percentage of time that he worked out of class.  
14 Appellant further argues that both Respondent and DOP agreed that he worked out of class but that  
15 he did not perform this work often enough to warrant reallocation. Appellant contends that he  
16 works 100 percent of the time and while he is working, he is required to do whatever tasks are  
17 required to complete a job whether or not those tasks are within the Carpenter classification.  
18 Because he is required to perform duties found in a number of trades classifications, Appellant  
19 asserts that his position should be reallocated to the Maintenance Mechanic II classification.

20  
21 **Summary of Respondent CWU's Argument.** Respondent argues that Appellant's position was  
22 allocated based on the preponderance of the duties and responsibilities he performs. Respondent  
23 acknowledges that Appellant performs duties outside of the Carpenter classification but contends  
24 that these duties are limited. Respondent asserts that a majority of Appellant's duties fall within the  
25 Carpenter classification and that his position is properly allocated.

1 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly  
2 allocated to the Carpenter classification should be affirmed.

3  
4 **Relevant Classifications.** Carpenter, class code 5330; Maintenance Mechanic II, class code 5243;  
5 and Mason/Plasterer, class code 5390.

6  
7 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
8 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
9 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
10 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
11 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
12 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
13 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
14 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

15  
16 Appellant asserts that the Board should consider the volume of work he performs. However, an  
17 allocation review does not measure the volume of work an incumbent produces. Rather, a review  
18 compares proportionally, the duties and responsibilities assigned to a position to the available  
19 classifications.

20  
21 Because a current and accurate description of a position's duties and responsibilities is documented  
22 in an approved position description, the position description becomes the basis for allocation of a  
23 position. An allocation determination must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities, as  
24 document in the PD. Appellant's PD indicates that a majority of his duties and responsibilities fit  
25 within the Carpenter classification.

1 The definition of the Mason/Plasterer classification states, "[p]erform journey-level masonry and  
2 plastering work." The distinguishing characteristics state that this class encompasses positions that  
3 perform bricklaying, plastering and cement finishing in the repair, alteration and maintenance of  
4 buildings, facilities, equipment and grounds. Appellant does not perform mason/plasterer duties a  
5 majority of the time. Therefore, allocation of his position to this classification is not appropriate.

6  
7 The definition of the Maintenance Mechanic II classification states, "[p]erform skilled work in the  
8 operation, maintenance, repair, remodeling, and construction of buildings, grounds, machinery,  
9 facilities, and equipment." This definition appears to encompass some of the duties and  
10 responsibilities assigned to Appellant's position. However, the distinguishing characteristics state,  
11 "[p]ositions allocated to this class inspect, repair, install, and maintain physical facilities requiring  
12 skilled mechanical and trades work. This class requires a good working knowledge of several  
13 related skill fields such as electrical, plumbing, carpentry, welding, and machinist work." (Emphasis  
14 added). Appellant does not perform skilled mechanical work such as repairing motors, laundry,  
15 kitchen and air-conditioning equipment; or operating, maintaining and repairing electrical,  
16 mechanical and structural systems of buildings and utility distribution. Therefore, allocation of his  
17 position to this classification is not appropriate.

18  
19 The definition of the Carpenter classifications states, "[p]erform journey-level carpentry work."  
20 The distinguishing characteristics state, "[p]ositions allocated to this class are distinguished by the  
21 responsibility to perform journey-level carpentry work in the maintenance, repair and construction  
22 of institution facilities." The Director's designee correctly determined that the overall  
23 preponderance of Appellant's duties and responsibilities are described by the Carpenter  
24 classification. While Appellant occasionally performs work in other trades, for the most part, this  
25 work is incidental to his carpentry assignments and does not constitute a majority of his duties and  
26 responsibilities.

1  
2 Occasionally, Appellant is assigned to projects that require him to perform work in other trades  
3 areas. Chapter 251 WAC provides options for compensating employees who are temporarily  
4 assigned higher-level duties. We encourage Respondent to work with Appellant to resolve the issue  
5 of compensation when he performs higher-level project duties.

6  
7 In regard to Appellant's concern that he failed to provide adequate information during the allocation  
8 review process, we suggest that he review the provisions of WAC 251-06-060. The rule  
9 provides, in part, that:

10 Whenever an employee feels that his/her position is not allocated to the proper class,  
11 the employee or his/her representative may request a position review by the  
12 personnel officer, provided:

13 (a) The request must be in writing and describe the work assigned and performed  
14 which is alleged to be outside the class specification, and

15 (b) Six months must have elapsed since the date of the employee's last request for a  
16 review of this position as provided in this section.

17 Because six months have elapsed since the date of his last request for review, pursuant to WAC  
18 251-06-060, Appellant may initiate another position review of his position.

19  
20 **Conclusion.** Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Carpenter classification and his appeal  
21 should be denied. The determination of the Director, dated January 2, 2001, should be affirmed and  
22 adopted.

23 / / / /

24 / / / /

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**ORDER**

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of John Delashaw is denied and the determination of the Director, dated January 2, 2001, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Leana D. Lamb, Member